

OPEN LETTERS.

ON THE VALUE OF SECTION NAMES.

I HAD imagined that when a section was given generic rank, there would not be any difference of opinion, at the present day, as to the generic value of the section name, provided always that it agreed in form with generic names, and was the earliest name (not preoccupied) for the group. In the just published *Contrib. U. S. Nat. Herb.* 5: no. 3, Dr. Rose takes a different view, and uses names for two genera (*Vaseyanthus* and *Brandegea*) which are of later date than section names which he places in their synonymy. It is evident that he feels justified in doing this because the generic names were proposed as generic names at a time when the section names were not known to represent the same groups. As the matter is of some importance, it may be well to test it by these cases, so I give the two alternatives. Dr. Rose writes thus:

(1) GENUS, *Vaseyanthus* Cogn. 1891; SYN. *Echinocystis* § *Pseudoechinopepon* Cogn. 1890; TYPE, *Vaseyanthus Rosei* Cogn. 1891.

(2) GENUS, *Brandegea* Cogn. 1890; SYN. *Sicyos* § *Heterosicyos* S Watson. 1888.

It seems to me it should be:

(1) GENUS, *Pseudoechinopepon* Cogn. 1890; SYN. *Vaseyanthus* Cogn. 1891; TYPE, *Pseudoechinopepon Brandegei* (Cogn. 1890).

(2) GENUS, *Heterosicyos* S. Wats. 1888; SYN. *Brandegea* Cogn. 1890; TYPE, *Heterosicyos minimus* (S. Wats. 1888).

—T. D. A. COCKERELL, *Mesilla, N. M.*